

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as currently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 7-23 are currently pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 14 are amended and Claims 5 and 6 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7, 10, 11, and 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,163, hereinafter “Bang”) in view of Snyder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,989, hereinafter “Snyder”); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang and Snyder, and further in view of Westerman (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,443); Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang and Snyder, and further in view of Oder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,594, hereinafter “Oder”); and Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang and Snyder, and further in view of Muller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,473, hereinafter “Muller”).

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang in view of Snyder, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites:

displaying on a display a plurality of windows, each including at least one responsive object respectively associated with one of multiple functions of the at least one system of the aircraft, each window including one default field on which a cursor arrives after moving from one window to another window;

moving the cursor in a continuous manner on the display so as to designate a responsive object;

moving the cursor in a discrete manner on the display, responsive object by responsive object, so as to designate a responsive object; and

moving the cursor discretely from one window to another window in the plurality of windows.

The outstanding Office Action at page 6, line 21 concedes that Bang does not disclose a default field. The outstanding Office Action asserts from page 5, line 21 to page 6, line 5 that “Snyder et al. disclose each window is divided into a plurality of fields each including at least one responsive object (see at least column 4, lines 32-65), and each window includes one default field on which the cursor arrives after moving from one widow to another window (see column 4, lines 13-31).”

Initially, it is respectfully noted that Claim 1 recites “a plurality of windows,” not “a plurality of fields” as stated in the outstanding Office Action. In fact, Snyder describes a ***single window*** at column 4, lines 32-65. For example, column 4, lines 13-19 of Snyder states:

With reference now to FIG. 3, another exemplary cockpit display 114/300 suitably includes various menu bars (such as menu bar 320) or buttons 306 that may be present in a top portion 322 of ***the*** window, a bottom portion 304 of ***the*** window, or any other portion of ***the*** window. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, display 114/300 of Snyder only includes a single window, “***the*** window” discussed above. As the cited portion of Snyder does not describe multiple windows, it certainly does not describe “moving the cursor discretely from one window to another window in the plurality of windows” as recited in Claim 1.

Further, with regard to the discussion at column 4, lines 13-31 of Snyder, the outstanding Office Action did not cite any specific field as the alleged default field, and column 4, lines 13-31 of Snyder does not discuss or identify a default field. Additionally, as Snyder does not teach or suggest moving a cursor from one window to another window, it is respectfully submitted that Snyder does not teach or suggest “each window including one default field on which a cursor arrives after moving from one window to another window.”

As the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-16 and 21-23 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Bang in view of Snyder.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 8 as unpatentable over Bang in view of Snyder and further in view of Westerman, it is noted that Claim 8 is dependent from Claim 1, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Westerman does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Bang and Snyder. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is patentable over Bang in view of Snyder and further in view of Westerman.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 9 as unpatentable over Bang in view of Snyder and further in view of Oder, it is noted that Claim 9 is dependent from Claim 1, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Oder does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Bang and Snyder. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 is patentable over Bang in view of Snyder and further in view of Oder.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bang in view of Snyder, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 recites in part, “moving said cursor from window to window using an auxiliary displacement key.”

The outstanding Office Action concedes at page 6, lines 17-18 that Bang does not describe a plurality of windows. The outstanding Office Action asserts at page 6, lines 22-23 that Snyder describes moving a cursor from window to window using an auxiliary displacement key at column 3, line 39 to column 4, line 65. However, it is respectfully submitted that this portion of Snyder only describes the movement of a cursor using cursor control device 104. As cursor control device 104 is described as a joystick, mouse, or

trackball that converts an input to a graphical position on a display,¹ cursor control device 104 is not “an auxiliary displacement key” as recited in Claim 17. Even if a joystick, mouse, or trackball includes a button, it is respectfully submitted that this button is used to select an item highlighted by the cursor, not to move the cursor. Further, the outstanding Office Action does not identify any key described in Snyder as “an auxiliary displacement key.” Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that neither Snyder nor Bang teach or suggest “moving the cursor discretely from one window to another window in the plurality of windows” as recited in Claim 17. Thus, Claims 17 (and Claims 18-20 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Bang in view of Snyder.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-4 and 7-23 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward Tracy

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Edward Tracy
Registration No. 47,998

¹See Snyder, column 3, lines 8-11.